



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

That is, the average in the three required subjects of those in the Latin section was 67.56; their average in Latin was 65.33.

## II

Percentage of each Group above the Median of each Group

Group 1		Latin sec.	Ger- man	French
67.56	Latin median attained by	50.0	36.0	41.0
63.21	German " " "	64.0	50.0	52.0
64.51	French " " "	63.0	47.0	50.0
Group 2				
68.18	Latin " " "	50.0	42.5	42.4
65.19	German " " "	57.6	50.0	48.3
64.98	French " " "	57.9	52.0	50.0

That is, the Latin average of 67.56 in the three subjects other than Latin is attained by 36 per cent of the German section and 41 per cent of the French section in the same three subjects.

## III

Percentage of Passing Grades

Group 1	English	Math.	Biology	Three	Language
Latin .....	86.7	73.8	85.6	82.0	69.4
German .....	72.9	66.2	75.7	71.6	61.2
French .....	78.6	67.4	78.6	74.9	57.7
Group 2					
Latin .....	90.6	71.3	89.0	83.6	76.9
German .....	80.2	69.8	81.0	77.3	71.6
French .....	87.6	72.3	70.8	76.9	71.3

That is, in the Latin section of group 1, 86.7 per cent of English grades, 73.8 of mathematics, 85.6 of biology, etc., were 60 or more.

Other tables are given showing other phases of the investigation, which those interested may consult. The conclusions drawn are (1) The Latin group holds first place in every subject, the German second in biology and the foreign language, the French group second in English and mathematics. (2) No group does so well in the foreign language as in the other subjects. The descending order of excellence is Latin, German, French. (3) Difference in grades is not due to distribution of teachers.

Of course, as the investigators say, these investigations do not of necessity determine which language produces the best pupils, but rather, perhaps, which language is chosen by the best pupils in this particular school. On the other hand, as I have repeatedly said, Latin is at present very well taught in this city, and it does seem that some allowance should be made for this. Of course Latin has the reputation of being more difficult than the other languages and may thus frighten away those who are afraid of hard work. But, in any way these results are looked at, we classicists must feel a glow of satisfaction that what we have always maintained is apparently proven by this demonstration. Latin is food for two classes, the mentally strong, and the morally strong, that is, for those whose minds are naturally called by those subjects which test their mettle, and those whose wills triumph over obstacles and thus bring a more perfect growth to the whole man.

G. L.

# **SOME REFLECTIONS UPON THE RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATIONS IN LATIN SET BY THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD FOR 1912<sup>1</sup>**

At the close of the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board last June it was agreed that each reader should send to the chief reader a report embodying his impressions of the merits and the defects of the question-papers, the answer-books, and the methods of rating these books, and that the chief reader should take steps to bring the conclusions of his colleagues and himself to the attention of the schools. The reports were duly made, but circumstances prevented for some time the further execution of the project. It was, therefore, with special pleasure that I received and accepted the courteous invitation of your Acting Secretary to present to you a paper on this subject. I recalled the fact that your Association had taken the initiative in asking for the creation of the Commission on College Entrance Requirements in Latin, which ultimately met at Cleveland in October, 1909. I recalled, further, that according to the very interesting statistical tables of Professor Fiske, published in the Educational Review for February, 1912, the proportion of successful candidates among the boys and the girls representing the schools of New England was distinctly greater in both the new and the old requirements in Latin than the general percentage of such success for the total number of candidates examined by the Board in this subject. I was thus warranted in feeling certain, as I do, that you would regard sympathetically the reflections which I have to lay before you. These reflections do not rest upon any basis of statistics, although in a few cases I shall be able to give some figures. They represent only the impressions of the readers. But these impressions were the result of continuous reading for a period of eleven days in which, during the six hours that were devoted each day to the work, there was constant interchange of opinion as to the value of answers whose merit was in doubt. To secure greater uniformity in the rating the entire committee of readers was divided into four groups, and, with three exceptions, all the answer-books in each subject were read by a single group. The chief reader played the part of a balance-wheel and was, in somewhat rapid succession, a member of all four groups. Thus in all that I may have to say about the answer-books in N R 3, 4, and 6, I am expressing, in addition to my opinion, the opinions, in each case, of seven readers. A group of six was responsible for all the work under the old requirements. The three exceptions were N R 1, 2, and 5 where in each case two groups were involved of thirteen, four-

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Eighth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of New England, at Worcester, April 12, 1913.

teen, and fourteen readers respectively. It will be readily understood, however, that the interest of the readers was not confined to the particular answer-books with which they dealt. There was much discussion of the results of all the question-papers outside of working hours, and I feel reasonably sure that this paper represents the unanimous or nearly unanimous feeling of the entire committee of twenty-eight.

Let me emphasize at the outset that the new requirements do not involve any reduction whatever in the total amount to be read. On the contrary, the Commission felt that the substitution of sight examinations in prescribed work would have a tendency to increase rather than to reduce the amount which would actually be read. But a very notable reduction was made in the amount of the prescribed work. Caesar was eliminated altogether, Cicero was reduced to 45% of the old requirement, Vergil to 48%, if Book IV should be chosen, or to 52%, if Book VI should be preferred. To appreciate fully the extent of the reduction, let us note that, whereas the old requirements prescribed for the *second* year the first four books of Caesar complete, the new prescribe for the *third* year the Pro Archia, which is equivalent to 35% of Book I of Caesar, and the Pro Lege Manilia, which is equivalent to 79% of the same Book. The two speeches together are thus about equivalent to Book I of Caesar increased by 1/7 of itself, and are somewhat less in amount than one half of the old prescription for the *previous* year of the High School course. When we consider that the whole prescription in Cicero, for the *third* year of the study of Latin, is but 36 pages of the standard Teubner text of 37 lines to a page, and that, if the Aeneid were printed as prose, the prescription for the *fourth* year would be about 55 or 60 such pages, according as Book IV or Book VI were chosen, it cannot well be claimed that the amount representing this kind of work is too great to be prepared by the pupils with care and precision.

But why should any portion at all of the reading be prescribed for examination? Why should not the examinations be wholly at sight? Let me answer this question by a quotation from the admirable paper of Professor Kirtland on The New Latin Requirements which was read before this Association in April, 1910, and subsequently published in The Classical Journal for June of the same year (5.340-352). He said (343-344):

The Committee of Ten, which recommended that translation at sight should "form a constant and increasing part of the examination for admission", deferred to the views of those who feel that the faithful student of small ability should be given an opportunity to show his thoroughness in the performance of a fixed task. It is important, however, that the task be not too heavy, and that it really be done thoroughly. It is a benefit, too, if the reading appointed for this intensive study is so precious as to

justify the effort to make it a *κρῆμα ἐς ἀέλ*. Perhaps the prevailing entrance requirements satisfy the last of these conditions, but it is notorious that the examinations manifest, on the whole, a most disheartening lack of thoroughgoing knowledge of anything. A smaller prescription will render it easy to exact the clearest and fullest understanding of this amount, surely a better thing than the nebulous ideas which the colleges now feel obliged to accept as evidence of acquaintance with the works prescribed—better, whether regarded as discipline or as acquisition.

"A smaller prescription will render it easy to exact the clearest and fullest understanding of this amount". These words are most pertinent to the main object of this paper. The new requirements represent a compromise between opposing views. There were, alike in the Commission and in the country at large, those who believed that ability to translate at sight should be the one thing demanded of candidates for admission to College. But there were those also who believed no less earnestly that the attainment of that thoroughness, that most desirable thoroughness of which Professor Kirtland spoke, would be seriously imperilled unless some portion of the work were prescribed to gain this particular end. The amount actually prescribed is small; the end for which it was prescribed is the achievement of precision. We readers felt, therefore, that we had a right to expect and to demand definite excellence in three things: (1) the understanding of the thought of the passage, as a sensible and coherent description of persons, things or the course of events; (2) the choice of the English words employed in the translation and the arrangement of the English sentences; (3) the accuracy of the information given in the answers to the questions upon the subject-matter of the passage. In brief, we looked for an exhibition of intelligence, at work upon a small area and therefore working under conditions highly favorable for its display. But the Report of the Secretary of the Board for 1912 shows that 60% or higher was secured by only 60% of the 656 candidates in N R 4 who were recommended by the schools "on the ground of full and satisfactory preparation" and by only 53.4% of the 491 similarly recommended candidates in N R 5. In the words of one of the readers,

in carelessness, inexactness, poor English on the one hand, and frequent entire misunderstanding of the intention of a passage on the other, the translation, I should suppose, could not well have been worse if passages had been set upon the basis of six required orations of Cicero and six books of Vergil, nor could the answers to questions on the text have shown much more inadequate preparation.

The mortality in N R 4 and 5 is not due to the sight passage. The translation at sight had rather a tendency to raise the rating of the answer-books, and in a noticeable number of instances its rendering was far superior to that of the passages from the prescribed work. In fact, the Board's statistics for

N R 3, in which the translation is wholly at sight, are far more encouraging, 72.6% of the 449 recommended candidates being rated at 60% or higher. One serious difficulty lies in the lack of any real practical knowledge of forms and their meanings. Consider the fact that in N R 1 only 65.1% of 607 recommended candidates were able to secure 60% or higher although the values assigned to the separate questions were such that 62% could be obtained by correct answers to the questions involving declension, conjugation and comparison of adjectives and adverbs alone. I must frankly say, in passing, that the results of the examination in Grammar are to me incomprehensible. This ignorance or neglect of the values of forms led in N R 5 to such combinations, by no means infrequent, as these: *portas prima*, 'the first gates'; *arces Tritonia*, 'Tritonian citadels'; *periuria gentis*, 'the perjured race'; *puer Iliaca*, 'the Trojan boy'; *gente Latinos*, 'the Latin race'. *Sinet* and *accipiet* were often translated as subjunctives. Words were confused with others of similar appearance. Thus *umida* was confused with *umeros*, *portas* with *portus*, *morere* with *morare*, *tumulum* with *tumultum*. In one case *fumum* was taken as *famam*, and *undantem fumum* was rendered 'ungiven fame', in cheerful disregard, not to speak of other points, of the difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin negative prefix.

This last instance brings me to a very grave aspect of the failures. Certain translations are not merely wrong. In the given context they make nonsense, and show that the candidate is translating words only and not words as a means of expressing an idea or telling a story. Within certain limits a few such errors might be attributed to nervousness, but last June the readers were struck by the large number of answer-books in which in the prescribed work the main drift of a passage was misunderstood or in which a whole translation was quite incoherent, showing no conception whatever of the development of the thought, though most of the words were translated correctly and many even of the clauses. We could not help thinking that the failure of a considerable number of candidates was directly chargeable to poor teaching. The two speeches of Cicero are intensely human documents. The argument for the passage of the bill of Manilius may easily be brought into relation with modern problems, and an important part of it is closely germane to recent political discussion in this country. The really valuable part of the speech for Archias, the praise of poetry and letters as directly serviceable to the highest interests of the State, is perennially interesting and indefinitely capable of application to the conditions of national life. The two speeches together, in the hands of an alert and well-read teacher, provide admirable material for conveying to a class some conception, in terms of flesh and blood, of the true greatness of Rome.

The story of the Aeneid is finely dramatic, and Book II and Books I and IV have, as you all know, actually been dramatized for school presentation by Professor F. J. Miller. May we not venture to say with truth that no teaching deserves to be called good teaching which does not definitely seek to make the pupil visualize the content of each paragraph in turn, both in itself and in its relation to the argument or action as a whole? In all the prescribed work, should not each pupil be induced, cajoled, compelled, perhaps, to believe that he is for the moment Cicero, that he is addressing an audience, that he is choosing his words carefully to make his reasoning as clear and as cogent to his hearers as possible and to persuade them to adopt his views of the facts that he presents? Or again, that he is playing the part of Aeneas, Venus, Laocoon, Sinon, Dido, Anchises, as the case may be, that he is stirred with a definite emotion and choosing such words as will give it adequate expression? Some such sane and tangible understanding of Cicero's arguments, of Vergil's story is obviously indispensable: else words alone are the objects of our study, not words as symbols of ideas. The lack of such a sensible and concrete understanding, with the errors in translation and in the answers to questions on the text which were directly due to that lack, was largely responsible for the poor showing in N R 4 and 5. The total number of candidates in N R 5 was 693. A partial count kept by one of the readers gave the following results. In 70 answer-books not more than 5 points out of a possible 14 were made on the translation of the passage set from Book VI. In 76 answer-books not more than 2 points out of a possible 8 were made on the questions on the text of the alternative passages set from Books IV and VI. In the case of the following questions the number of answer-books indicated after each received no credit at all. On Aen. 2.604-616: "Under what circumstances were these words spoken? What effect was the vision here described intended to produce upon the one who was to see it? Why did the speaker think it necessary to say *tu . . . recusa?*" 106. "Why was Juno *saevissima* to Troy?" 40. "What precisely is meant by *Gorgone saeva?*" 65. On Aen. 4.537-547: "Why is *Laomedontea* a term of reproach?" 46. "Explain the allusion in *Sidonia urbe*." 44. On Aen. 6.867-877: "Of what recital does this passage form a part?" 30. "Who is meant by *hunc?*" 50. "Explain the reference in *Mavortis*." 40. "Explain the reference in *Campus*." 39. The examinations made it only too evident that there is sad need of greater emphasis upon the movement and the details of the story, the motives animating the principal characters, a decent knowledge of myth, history and geography. The treatment of scansion was far from satisfactory. One reader found only 12 books in which it was entirely correct. *Mortalis* | *hebetat* | *visus* | was a division of frequent occur-

rence. In a considerable number of books the caesura was placed in the middle of a word.

In N R 4 the greatest trouble was caused by the passage from the Pro Archia. You recall the familiar words of the opening sentences: Carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius, itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore; cuius laudibus certe non solum ipse qui laudatur sed etiam populi Romani nomen ornatur. In caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur; magnus honos populi Romani rebus adiungitur. Let me give you some renderings which in their kind were of frequent occurrence:

'Africanus was dear and our Ennius was superior and also it is thought that Scipio has been constructed in marble'. 'Our dear Ennius was among the more powerful men in Africa'. 'Our Ennius was superior to Africanus and thus even in the sepulcher it is thought that this one had been sculptured from the marble of the Scipios'. 'Our Ennius was dear in farthest Africa and in this way even in the temple Scipio is thought to be made from marmore'. 'He was beloved even more than our Ennius by Africanus and so in his grave he is thought to be a Scipio carved in marble'. 'Cato was tolerant to this man in heaven'. 'Cato worked in his temple'. 'Cato carried on the slaughter of the proavus; the Roman people join together for honors these great things'.

I beg of you to note that these and many other similar translations are not merely wrong; they reduce Cicero's argument to nonsense. Ennius was variously described. He was, for instance, in different answer-books, (a) Scipio's patron and friend; (b) a Carthaginian; (c) one of the few poets of the time who wrote peaceful poetry, so he had a cultivating influence upon the Roman people; (d) a sculptor and through his works has handed down the life and characters of the past. In like fashion Africanus was (a) a slave boy who rose rapidly in the Roman Empire; (b) one of the Roman slaves who excited a great revolution among them which was put down by Pompey; (c) famous for his fight against Pompey at Pharsalia; (d) the brother of Hannibal. At the best, the knowledge of the candidates did not, as a rule, go beyond this description: 'Africanus was a general in the Punic wars and he saved the honor of the Roman people by his deeds in that war'. And yet, when one considers the immense significance of the Second Punic War in the history of Rome and of Western Europe, it is surely not unreasonable to expect some more detailed acquaintance with a name so famous.

The results in Composition were somewhat encouraging. 60% or higher was secured by 63.4% of the 424 recommended candidates. But the readers were struck by the frequency with which knowledge of things relatively difficult was combined with ignorance of things relatively elementary. As one of them wrote to me:

In N R 6 there were a considerable number who could manage conditions and could write *nolite dubi-*

*tare quin*, but whose pronouns owned no laws of agreement and who compelled us to speculate whether a verb as written was intended for indicative or subjunctive. And the forms of *posse* were beyond belief. Out of 118 books 28 failed in the conjugation of this verb. The following forms were noted. *potebamus; poterebar, poterem, potus esset, potuissetur, posseret*.

Four disconnected matters deserve longer comment than is now possible. (1) The questions on tense were, as usual, very poorly answered. The great majority of the candidates avoided them altogether. Those who did attempt an explanation commonly invoked 'sequence' or 'the rule for sequence' for indicatives and infinitives as well as for subjunctives. The answer often consisted of two words only: 'primary sequence'; 'secondary sequence'. Very rarely was the distinction noted between incomplete and completed action. (2) Little attention seems to be given to the study of derivation. But is not this a useful and thoroughly sound way of getting a pupil to associate a new word with one already familiar and thus welding his knowledge together? Even if the facts were, in themselves, unimportant, he should surely gain from his reading some practical understanding of the way in which a language grows. (3) The treatment of proper names was extremely vexatious. Many candidates kept the form in which a name appeared on the question-paper, and so wrote *Pompey* in a Latin sentence and *Illyrico, Cornifici, Calenum* in an English sentence. Others carefully changed Glabrio (in an English sentence) to *Glabrius*. In spite of the prominence of Mithridates in the speech for the Manilian Law, his name was at times regarded as plural and it was asserted that Lucullus waged war *cum Mithridatibus*. In the passage from the defence of Archias, *Rudinum* was variously rendered 'of the Rudines', 'of Rudina', 'of the Rudini', 'of Rudes', 'of Rhodes', 'of Rudus'; scarcely ever 'of Rudiae'. (4) Perhaps we must frankly admit that our young protégés, like Romeo's love, "read by rote and cannot spell". Yet it seems as if certain words at least which constantly recur in class-work might have their due. The serenity of the readers was much disturbed by the frequency of the following forms: grammer, indicitive, imperative, infinative, moad, peanult, ascent, prodisis, apoddisis, Galls, Ceasar, Trogians.

I have said almost nothing about the handling of the passages to be translated at sight. The results last June seemed to call rather for a discussion of the failures in the prescribed work. One thing, however, should always be borne in mind. The new definitions do not mean that the four speeches against Catiline or their equivalent and three books of Vergil or their equivalent are to be read in the schools at sight. They are to be prepared no less carefully than before—but solely with reference to the development of the power to read Latin, not that the pupil may be trained to pass an examination

upon them. There is no better way, no way so good, to gain the desired ability. If a pupil does his work honestly, the translating of a properly selected passage at sight differs in one respect only from the preparation of a regular lesson: he uses, instead of a vocabulary and some notes, the knowledge which he has stored in his head. As one of the readers wrote me, "sight reading is a test of ability rather than a means of securing it".

May I express, in closing, my sense of gratitude to the readers with whom I have been associated? Their loyalty and care are beyond praise. If the candidates were as anxious to acquire and display a knowledge of Latin as the readers are concerned to give credit for every atom of knowledge that is discernible, these reflections would have been roseate indeed.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

NELSON G. MCCREA.

### REVIEWS

A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Buecheler's *Carmina Epigraphica Latina*. By Judson Allen Tolman, Jr. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1910). Pp. ix + 120. 80 cents.

*Taedium Vitae* in Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions. By Clara Louise Thompson. Saint Louis, 1911. Pp. vii + 53.

Both these monographs are interesting and profitable studies, which emphasize the human element that appears in Roman epitaphs. Professor Tolman's work is particularly full and elaborate. He takes as the basis of his investigation the *Carmina Epigraphica Latina* published by Buecheler (Leipzig, 1895, 1897) and classifies the instances of every form of human feeling manifested in them. The results are very useful to the student of sociology and religion. An interesting chapter (I: pages 1-17) discusses the form and the character of the inscriptions, their style and composition. The second chapter (18-51) reviews the commonplace expressions found in the inscriptions, such as *hic situs est, sit tibi terra levis*, the *quiesco* formulas (worked out fully by Church, *Beiträge zur Sprache der Lateinischen Grabinschriften*, München, 1901), and recurrent topics, such as premature death, the envy of fate, and others. In the next chapter (52-75) the religious references are treated, the belief in the gods in general as guiding the affairs of men, and in the power exerted by fate, so frequently mentioned in the inscriptions by the words *fata*, *Parcae*, and *fortuna*. In the succeeding chapter (76-96), one of the most interesting, we have brought before us expressions of consolation, pessimism, and frivolity, and in the last chapter (97-120) the inscriptions that show a belief in the immortality of the soul. Throughout there are numerous citations from literary sources which confirm the sentiments of the inscriptions. Although here and there one may not agree with Professor Tolman in his interpretations, the plan

of the work is well carried out and the wonder is that such a study was not made long ago.

Dr. Thompson's thesis is a more detailed study of one phase of human emotion as revealed by the inscriptions, namely, expressions of *taedium vitae*, the weariness of life which welcomes death as a release from care and pain. It was temperamental merely or was caused by grief for the death of others, by worry, toil, anxiety, physical suffering, and old age. Literary parallels are frequently cited. These pages form interesting reading for one who reflects upon the common lot of life and realizes that human feeling remains unchanged through the centuries.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

WALTER DENNISON.

The Wars of Greece and Persia. Selections from Herodotus in Attic Greek. Edited by W. D. Lowe. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1912). Pp. 128. 60 cents.

These simplified selections from the delightful pages of Herodotus offer the beginner in Greek excellent material for reading which can be undertaken early. The editor has well chosen the imperishable tales: of Croesus and Solon, the emerald ring of Polycrates, the story of Alcmaeon packed with gold-dust, the piety of Cleobis and Biton, the folly of Xerxes, the ambition of Peisistratus, the glory of Marathon, Salamis and Plataea.

Mr. Lowe has altered the non-Attic constructions and forms, while leaving the vocabulary largely unchanged, in order to preserve the Herodotean color. He strangely retains Ionic *ἐς*. In both vocabulary and text he has made the slip of giving *προεβύω* as intransitive. The notes are simple and adapted for beginners. This accounts for a few dogmatic statements on disputed matters, of which a serious instance is that on page 81: "Arion was a Greek lyric poet who flourished about 625 B.C.", etc. This is to give too exact information about a personality regarded as "one and the same with the mythical horse, the manifestation of Poseidon" (so Professor Smyth), or as "redender Name für den Preissinger" (Crusius), or some other abstraction. On the whole, however, it is an excellent little book with which to induct beginners into the beauty and wonder of Greek literature.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

An Elementary Greek Grammar. By E. E. Bryant and E. D. Lake, Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1912). Pp. 124. 60 cents.

This small book, arranged by two of the Assistant Masters of Charterhouse, is attractive to the eye with its good print and paper, and pleasant red binding. Its contents should make it useful in the hands of a skilled teacher, if employed in connection with some easy Greek reading-book. It contains the essential forms of the Greek language, presented in four stages, through which an English boy, beginning